

1 **RAMZY P. LADAH**
2 Nevada Bar No. 11405
3 **JOSEPH C. CHU**
4 Nevada Bar No. 11082
5 **LADAH LAW FIRM**
6 517 S. Third Street
7 Las Vegas, NV 89101
8 litigation@ladahlaw.com
9 T: 702.252.0055
0 F: 702.248.0055
1 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 GARY BERNSTEIN,
11 Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00246-JAD-VCF

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
EXTEND DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
CERTAIN CLAIMS**

ECF No. 26

19 The above-named parties, by and through their respective, undersigned counsel of record,
20 hereby stipulate to a two-week extension of time for Plaintiff to respond to Defendants' Blake
21 Reidhead, Inc. dba BDR Transport and Steven Thomas West's Motion to Dismiss Certain
22 Claims Per Rule 37(b)(2)(A).

REASONS FOR REQUESTED EXTENSION

24 The parties herein stipulate to reopen and extend the deadline for Plaintiff to respond to
25 Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Certain Claims Per Rule 37(b)(2)(A). (ECF No. 22). This
26 extension is being sought for two purposes, as described below. As also demonstrated, there
27 exists good cause and excusable neglect justifying the date of submission of this stipulation.
28

1 First, both of Plaintiff's above-listed attorneys (Messrs. Ladah and Chu) are currently
2 amidst a 15-day jury trial in Department 8 of the Eighth Judicial District Court, *Redekop v.*
3 *Palmer, et al.*, Case No. A-18-786061-C. For this reason, Defendants' counsel graciously agreed
4 to extend the deadline for Plaintiff's response to their above-referenced motion.

5 Second, on June 15, 2022, Plaintiff's counsel obtained a copy of an April 19, 2022
6 treatment record generated by Plaintiff's primary care physician, Kathleen Cansler, M.D., a copy
7 of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "1". April 19, 2022 was also the date scheduled for
8 Plaintiff's Rule 35 neuropsychologic examination with Dr. Staci Ross (ECF No. 21), and
9 Plaintiff's failure to appear for the same is the subject of Defendants' aforesaid motion. This
10 treatment record shows that Plaintiff presented to Dr. Cansler's office at 9:55 a.m., with a fever,
11 headache and runny nose. (Ex. 1). Accordingly, a specimen was taken that same day and
12 submitted for testing, which confirmed a positive finding of Covid-19. *Id.* In short, Plaintiff did
13 not appear for his April 19, 2022 Rule 35 examination with Dr. Ross because of flu-like
14 symptoms secondary to Covid-19.

15 Party counsel has preliminary met and conferred about the impact of Dr. Cansler's April
16 19, 2022 treatment note on Defendants' pending motion (insofar as it provides, from Plaintiff's
17 perspective, ample justification for Plaintiff's failure to appear for his Rule 35 examination).
18 However, further discussions on this issue have not progressed due to Plaintiff's counsel's
19 engagement in the aforementioned jury trial. Party counsel intends to resume these discussions,
20 however, on or before July 1, 2022. In the event these discussions do not yield and alternate
21 solution, the two-week extension of time sought herein leaves sufficient time for Plaintiff to file
22 a response to Defendants' motion.

23 The parties submit that the foregoing statements constitute good cause for the extension
24 of time requested herein. Further, Plaintiff's counsel respectfully submits that the failure to
25

LADAH LAW
FIRM



1 submit this stipulation prior to the deadline to oppose respond to Plaintiff's motion is the produce
 2 of excusable neglect, and should not prevent the Court's approval of the stipulated terms.
 3 Plaintiff's undersigned counsel mis-calendared Plaintiff's response deadline by one day (to
 4 Monday, June 20, 2022, rather than Friday, June 17, 2022). As counsel is currently in trial (and
 5 will be for at least another week), this mistake was not noticed until the evening of the June 17,
 6 2022. It bears emphasizing, however, that Plaintiff's counsel had discussed Plaintiff's intention
 7 to stipulate to extend the briefing deadlines approximately one week earlier, such that the parties
 8 had ample notice of this (proposed) extension. Nevertheless, Plaintiff's undersigned counsel
 9 apologizes for not submitting this stipulation prior to the response brief deadline.

10
 11 Accordingly, for the above reasons, the parties hereby stipulate and agree to extend the
 12 deadline for Plaintiff to respond to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Certain Claims Per Rule
 13 37(b)(2)(A) to **July 8, 2022**. (ECF No. 22).

14
 15 The parties enter this stipulation in good faith, and not for reasons of delay or any other
 16 untoward purpose.

17 DATED this 19th day of June, 2022.

18 **LADAH LAW FIRM**

19 /s/ *Joseph C. Chu, Esq.*

20 **RAMZY PAUL LADAH**

21 Nevada Bar No. 11405

22 **JOSEPH C CHU, ESQ.**

23 Nevada Bar No. 11082

24 517 S. Third Street

25 Las Vegas, NV 89101

26 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

DATED this 19th day of June, 2022.

WILSON ELSE

/s/ *Jonathan C. Pattillo, Esq.*

JONATHAN C. PATTILLO

Nevada Bar No. 13929

6689 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Suite 200

Las Vegas, NV 89119

Attorneys for Defendants

25 **ORDER**

26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27
 28  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE